

Is local writer practicing wing-nut welfare?

"Wing-nut welfare" is a little understood phenomenon, yet has a significant effect on our view of the world. For those not familiar with the term, it refers to the funding of writers, pundits, economists and other "thought leaders" that hew to conservative orthodoxy. Thought leaders are not the same thing as thoughtful leaders. Quite the contrary, thought leaders are often quite wrong about climate change, economics, immigration, the next election, gun control, and any number of issues where public perceptions affect public policy, and consequently the bottom lines of those whose interests they protect.

It matters not how wrong they are, they will always have a job so long as they reinforce conservative beliefs. The free market conservatives so claim to love has little to do with job security and hence the term "wing-nut welfare."

Therefore, when local conservative Robert Endlich writes one of his human-related-climate-change-denying pieces, he has little reason to fear that if he is not accurate in his views he will lose position or status among other conservatives. Far from it. Although he has background in meteorology, he has never published his "findings" in any peer-reviewed scientific journal. He writes pieces in editorial pages or for media outlets that share his "denier" views, but he writes not to convince scientists, only to sway public opinion. Is this an example of wing-nut welfare?

What we know for sure is that Mr. Endlich is very likely wrong. Studies published in "peer-reviewed scientific journals show that 97 percent ... of publishing climate scientists agree: Climate-warming trends over the past century are very likely due to human activities." The vast majority of scientific organizations globally have also endorsed this position. Endlich seems to be vying to be one of the last in the world to hold this increasingly untenable position.

Steve Watson,

Las Cruces

[Robert Endlich](#) ·
[Advanced Weather Officer at USAF Retired](#)

Poor Steve Watson,

First, on about 28 January he wrote: "Endlich is no climate scientist, but he pretends he is qualified to dispute the efforts of real climate scientists."

And then he has to eat crow when he finds out that I have an MS from Penn State, and spent almost 50 years as a meteorologist, 21 in the Air Force, 18 at White Sands

Missile Range, and 10 at NMSU PSL. My publications were Test Reports, Data Reports, and Technical Reports having to do with my work at HELSTF and the Army Atmospheric Sciences Laboratory at White Sands.

However, a scientist does not have to publish in the “peer reviewed literature” in order to have an appreciation for the scientific method, only a sound math and science background, curiosity about the natural world, and the ability to look things up. Science has to do with facts, measurements observations and data.

Steve, what are your credentials and how do you dispute a single fact that I mentioned? I challenged Steve to dispute a single fact, since he is dealing with science, my science, Earth Science. But, Steve and many others illiterate in the Sciences and Innumerate as well have to resort to name calling and false accusations.

About that oft-repeated 97% claim used by Steve, Obama, Kerry and the others who know nothing about science, there was another survey, by the American Meteorological Society, discussed here:

<https://judithcurry.com/2013/11/10/the-52-consensus/>

That’s right, there is significant disagreement in the community most concerned with the atmosphere, the AMS.

As stated above, science is about facts and measurements having to do with the real world. “Consensus science” is replete with failed proclamations:

About 50 years ago my late Dad was diagnosed with stomach ulcers, and was given Mylanta; about 10 years ago my sister was diagnosed with stomach ulcers and was given antibiotics for Helicobacter Pylori. The previous consensus was wrong; Marshall and Warren rewrote the textbooks with reference to what causes gastritis and gastric ulcers. In recognition of their discovery, they were awarded the 2005 Nobel Prize in Physiology or Medicine.[84]

HRT: In the past, Hormone Replacement Therapy (HRT) was widely recommended for the treatment of menopause and menopausal symptoms, as well as for the prevention of osteoporosis and heart disease. A large study known as the Women's Health Initiative (WHI) shed new light on how HRT is viewed. In 2002, HRT was referred to as the "Elixir of Youth". This golden period gradually deteriorated as studies started linking HRT with potentially life-threatening consequences, including a greater risk of breast cancer, ovarian cancer and other illnesses and conditions.

That’s correct the consensus was wrong.

My other degree is in Geology. I graduated from Rutgers with my bachelors in 1962, when the consensus was that continents were fixed and mountain building was from unstable geosynclines. Then came the sea floor observations of the 1960s and a new discipline, Plate Tectonics--so much for consensus science.

Steve, you only have to look at the Greenland Ice Core data to show the fluctuations in climate today are natural and that today’s climate is perfectly normal:

<http://www.climate4you.com/.../GISP2...>

Steve, if you look at the above chart and observe the temperature fluctuations, you might ask their source, and you might find that source here:

<http://www.essc.psu.edu/.../Mar1/Bond%20et%20al%202001.pdf>

Bond Cycles. Those thousand to 1500 year fluctuations are called Bond Cycles. That's right, there are natural fluctuations of climate that have been observed from Ice Cores, North Atlantic Deep Water Sediments, and even in the study of dendrochronology in the Alps:

http://www.iuf-berlin.org/.../prof._patzelt_berlin_4.12...

Regarding the last, it is in German, don't be afraid, scroll to the next to the last graphic and observe the present warm period in comparison with the past warm periods; there's nothing unusual to see here.

These three data sets agree about the dozen or so warm and cold periods of the past 10,000 years, and there is nothing in the data which suggest significant human influence or the climate catastrophe proclaimed by the prominent leftists of the day.

Steve, why don't you talk with Walt Rubel and arrange for an open debate? It would be fun!

Bob Endlich

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [Mar 7, 2016 5:13pm](#)



[Steve Watson](#) ·

[Las Cruces, New Mexico](#)

Mr Endlich, I think you should publish your findings in peer reviewed literature because you should receive the recognition you so richly deserve. A giant like yourself should only debate other giants in your field!! Debating a mere non-scientist like myself would only debase yourself, and you really should aim higher. Please keep us posted on when you will publish. I can't wait to find out how your extraordinary views are received by the scientific community.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [Mar 8, 2016 11:41am](#) · [Edited](#)



[Robert Endlich](#) ·

[Advanced Weather Officer at USAF Retired](#)

Steve Watson,

I am so sorry that you have had so much trouble with reading comprehension in your past life, even extending to today. Your self-admitted lack of science knowledge would mean that even if I published in the "peer reviewed literature," someone would have to explain it to you. However, please read to the bottom of this post to see some of what I

have written.

There are records and data sets I quoted above which show that there is nothing unusual about the present climate.

When asked that you cite one fact which disagrees with what I stated, you change the subject from climate facts to me. These are the twin logical fallacies of red herring and ad hominem

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Red_herring

And

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ad_hominem

It is obvious that not only can you not click on the links I provided, you can not learn from them. As said above, there are plenty of publications and papers by specialists in the field, there is no need for me to try to duplicate their work and words.

Here are two great pieces by MIT's Richard Lindzen:

<http://www.breitbart.com/.../mit-climate-scientist.../>

<http://www.climatedepot.com/.../mit-climate-scientist-dr.../>

Here is James Delingpole:

<http://www.breitbart.com/.../climate-alarmists-invent.../>

Here is Will Happer, physics professor at Princeton:

<http://www.wsj.com/.../SB10001424052702304636404577291352...>

Since you have so much trouble with science, perhaps I should tell you that Dr Happer has found that the reasons the models are wrong is that the absorption and emission spectra of the CO2 molecule were incorrectly estimated; Dr Happer discusses that here:

<http://www.firstthings.com/.../the-truth-about-greenhouse...>

If you continue to have trouble with reading comprehension, here is a youTube Video of Dr Happer:

<https://youtu.be/2Lye5liWuZw>

Are you concerned about Sea Level Rise acceleration?

Here is Nils Axel Morner:

<http://joannenova.com.au/.../are-sea-levels-rising-nils.../>

<http://antigreen.blogspot.com/.../the-latest-paper-from...>

as long as you are at that web site, there is this post of mine:

<http://antigreen.blogspot.com/.../james-hansen-denier...>

I did have a piece published about sea level rise:

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/.../history-falsifies-climate.../>

Are you concerned with Arctic Ice Extent? Then you might be interested in this post:

<https://www.masterresource.org/.../audubon-goes-over-the.../>

Caution for Steve Watson! The above article has charts and diagrams from the Norwegian Polar Institute and the Journal of Climate. If you need help reading them, since you are not a scientist and have a long-established problem of reading comprehension, I might be able to find someone who can explain them to you.

Bob Endlich.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [Mar 8, 2016 3:31pm](#)



[Steve Watson](#) ·

[Las Cruces, New Mexico](#)

Thanks for the links to your right wing sites, but they really seem like small potatoes compared to nobel laureates. They think there is a global warming problem, as does anyone that's not in the pocket of the fossil fuels industry. Check it out:

<http://thinkprogress.org/.../nobel-laureates-climate.../>

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [Mar 8, 2016 11:23pm](#) · [Edited](#)



[Robert Endlich](#) ·

[Advanced Weather Officer at USAF Retired](#)

Steve Watson, your ignorance is showing again...or is it still?

Have you ever been to college? Did you ever learn about the use of rhetoric and logic?

Were you sick that day? Did you not turn in those assignments?

Let's go through some of this. You mention my use of "right wing web sites."

Perhaps you are quite unaware that Judith Curry was once a darling of Mother Jones as here:

<http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2008/09/qa-judith-curry>

So why do you make this charge of me, when I quote her here?

<https://judithcurry.com/2013/11/10/the-52-consensus/>

I used Penn State's web site as my primary source for Bond Cycles for the original article published in SCIENCE and you say I'm using "right wing web sites?"

<http://www.essc.psu.edu/.../Mar1/Bond%20et%20al%202001.pdf> Laughable.

I use as my primary sources the Norwegian Polar Institute and the AMS Journal of Climate and you say that I am using right wing web sites? Seriously?

Some of my links are to Wikipedia, who gave the God Key to William Connolley, AKA Wikipedia's Climate Doctor, of whom you may read about here:

<http://www.nationalpost.com/opinion/columnists/story.html...> Is Wikipedia a "right-wing web site?"

Your last post cites Think Progress (tee hee) and, in that post, the words of Nobel laureates. Nice Try. In Logic those logical fallacies are called Argument ad Populum and Appeal to Authority. Since you are using these fallacies, perhaps you would benefit from my helping you to learn about them:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Argumentum_ad_populum this is the consensus fallacy, it is a false proposition. Didn't I just tell you about the false consensus on the cause of stomach ulcers?

Steve, you are a slow learner.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Argument_from_authority "such as when an authority is cited on a topic outside their area of expertise, when the authority cited is not a true expert.[1]"

Perhaps those Nobel Laureates can help you explain why the IPCC's peer-reviewed temperature forecasts are off by a factor of four:

<http://notrickszone.com/.../veteran-meteorologist-joe.../>

Click on the link and see how worthless the IPCC forecasts are!

Steve, doesn't this give you pause about your citing "peer-reviewed science," when I try to tell you that peer review is no substitute for the scientific method.

Steve, I mention that science is about facts, measurements, observations and data, and you use Think Progress. Perfect! You have proven to anyone who reads this that it is not about science, it is about politics.

I am an equal opportunity basher of those who abuse science for political gain, so I will bash Obama, Kerry, Clinton, Gore, as well as Mitt Romney, Lindsey Graham, Newt Gingrich, Nancy Pelosi, and John McCain although Gingrich admitted his mistake and McCain has seemingly regained some sanity on the topic in recent years.

Full Disclosure: I first met Joe Bastardi when he was about 8 years old. His Dad, Matt Bastardi, and I were Meteorology students together at Texas A&M in 1963-64 when I was a Basic Meteorology Student in the Air Force.

Joe and I meet at the climate conferences; I've met his son, Garrett. Joe and I are email pen pals.

I mentioned Sea Level, and here is a link to my post, History Falsifies Climate Alarmist Sea Level Claims,

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/.../history-falsifies-climate.../>

Here is one of my source web sites <http://www.ostia-antica.org/>

From the masthead: "This is a not-for-profit, scientific website."

Please look at this map

<http://www.ostia-antica.org/map/plan1.htm>

I have been fortunate to visit Rome twice, and have visited Ostia Antica, the port of ancient Rome in person.

Please observe the map and the location of the Tyrrhenian Sea; it should be obvious to even you, Steve, that Sea Level was a lot higher in the time of Claudius and Trajan than it is today.

Is <http://www.ostia-antica.org/> a right-wing web site?

Is the history of ancient Rome and the work of each of its emperors right-wing propaganda?

Or, is the IPCC being deliberately deceptive to you and the Nobel Laureates you quote in speaking about sea level rise?

OBTW, I have been to Lindau (it is called Insel Lindau) at least twice. It is on Lake Constance where Germany, Austria, and Switzerland come together; it is gorgeous.

Steve, you really need to brush up on the correct use of logic in making your arguments and not fall into the logical fallacies of consensus, appeal to authority, and argument ad hominem.

Bob Endlich

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · [Mar 9, 2016 10:04pm](#)